

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 9, 2008 issued in connection with the above-identified application. A request for continued examination accompanies this Amendment. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-22, 25 and 26 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1, 22, 25 and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with written description requirements under U.S. patent law. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 26 recites “a program stored on a computer-readable medium,” whereas the Applicants’ disclosure merely teaches that a program can be distributed through transmission media such as a storage medium and fails to disclose a computer-readable medium (see e.g., ¶19 of the Applicants’ disclosure). The Applicants have amended claim 26 to recite “a computer-readable storage medium.” Accordingly, the Applicants have limited the claim to a storage medium, as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, 22, 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,088, hereafter “Matsumoto”) in view of Barak (U.S. Patent No. 5,833,338, hereafter “Barak”) and Parulski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,414,811, hereafter “Parulski”). The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 26 to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites the following features:

“[a]n image transmission system comprising:

a plurality of image generating apparatuses, each of which is operable to generate an image; and

an image projecting apparatus operable to project the plurality of images transmitted from said image generating apparatus through a multimode, in which the plurality of images are simultaneously projected onto a projection screen divided into a plurality of segments,

whercin each image generating apparatus includes:

an image generating unit operable to generate an image;

a transmission image adjustment unit operable to perform image adjustment on one of an image transmission and an image projection by said image projecting apparatus; and

a transmission unit operable to transmit the adjusted image to said image projecting apparatus, and

said image projecting apparatus includes:

a receiving unit operable to receive the image transmitted from said image generating apparatus;

an output image adjustment unit operable to judge a content of the adjustment performed on the received image, and then to perform readjustment on the image based on the judgment; and

a projecting unit operable to project the readjusted image,

said transmission image adjustment unit is operable to perform image adjustment that corresponds to one of the multimode and a full-screen mode for projecting an image onto an entire area of the projection screen of said image projecting apparatus, and

said output image adjustment unit is operable to specify a mode of the projected images, to perform readjustment by prioritizing the images on which readjustment is performed currently, not to perform readjustment on the images in other image generating apparatuses received later by said receiving unit, in the case where the current readjustment being performed corresponds to the full-screen mode, and to perform readjustment by prioritizing the images in the other image generating apparatuses received later by said receiving unit, in the case where the current readjustment being performed corresponds to the multimode.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above are similarly recited in independent claims 22, 25 and 26 (as amended). Additionally, the features emphasized above are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., ¶[0009]-¶[0011]).

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 26) is characterized in that an output image adjustment unit and/or method performs readjustment by prioritizing the images on which readjustment is performed currently, and does not perform readjustment on the images in other image generating apparatuses received later, in the case

where the current readjustment being performed corresponds to the full-screen mode. Thus, the images received later are intermittently readjusted depending on the mode of the projected image in either the full-screen mode or the multimode. No such features are believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, although the Examiner relies on the combination of Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 26, the Examiner relies primarily on Matsumoto for disclosing or suggesting all the features of the claimed output image adjustment unit and/or method recited respectively in claims 1, 22, 25 and 26. However, the Applicants assert that Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the claimed output image adjustment unit and/or method recited respectively in claims 1, 22, 25 and 26, as amended.

Matsumoto discloses a multiple images display system displaying images from a plurality of image sources (PC) 101 to 104 on a display device 700. According to Matsumoto, when priorities (display priorities) are allocated in the order in which the connections are detected, and thus an image is selected by the manipulation of the button of a display pointer or by moving a display cursor, the priorities are re-allocated such that the selected image receives the first priority. Accordingly, in Matsumoto, an image with a higher priority has a lower thinning-out rate, and thus is displayed larger.

Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest that intermittent readjustment is performed on the images received later depending on the two modes. For example, in Matsumoto, the priority on the image received later is the lowest of all the other images, with the image displayed either in the full-screen mode or the multimode. In the present invention, however, the priority on the image received later is high as far as the image is displayed in the multimode. Thus, the image is readjusted and projected.

In the present invention, the output image adjustment unit and or method specifies a mode of the projected images to perform readjustment by prioritizing the images on which readjustment is performed currently, not to perform readjustment on the images in other image generating apparatuses received later by said receiving unit, in the case where the current readjustment being performed corresponds to the full-screen mode; and to perform readjustment

by prioritizing the images in the other image generating apparatuses received later by said receiving unit, in the case where the current readjustment being performed corresponds to the multimode.

As noted above, the Examiner does not rely on Barak or Parulski to disclose or suggest the features of the claimed output image adjustment unit and/or method of the present invention. Moreover, after a detailed review of Barak and Parulski, the references fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Matsumoto. Therefore, no combination of Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 22, 25 and 26 (as amended). Additionally, no combination of Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski would result in, or otherwise render obvious claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, 17 by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Barak and Parulski, and further in view of Dayton et al. (an article entitled “Photoshop 5/5 Wow! Book” Copyright 2000, hereafter “Dayton”); and claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Barak and Parulski, and further in view of Taaffc et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,046,027, hereafter “Taaffc”).

Additionally, claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Barak and Parulski, and further in view of Karasawa et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0122075, “Karasawa”); claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Barak and Parulski, and further in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,264,838, hereafter “Johnson”); and claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Barak and Parulski, and further in view of Hua (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0013434, “Hua”).

Claims 9, 11, 16, 19, 20 and 21 depend (i.e., either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 1. As noted above, Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski fail to disclose or suggest all the features noted above in independent claim 1. Additionally, after a detailed review of Dayton, Taaffc, Karasawa, Johnson and Hua, the references (either individually or in combination) fail to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski.

Accordingly, no combination of Matsumoto, Barak and Parulski with Dayton, Taaffe, Karasawa, Johnson or Hua would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 9, 11, 16, 19, 20 and 21 at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 1.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yasuaki SAKANISHI et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By:2009.01.07 11:58:44 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 7, 2009